The Un-Ams Dabble in Racism, P. 4

14 Democratic Congressmen Call for 4-Power Talks to Block Spread of Nuclear Weapons, Page 2

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. VIII, NO. 10 MARCH 14, 1960 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

The Democrats Begin to Veer Away from The Arms Race

In 1928, that ill-fated year, the Republicans campaigned on the promise of putting two cars in every garage. Up until last week it began to look as if the Democrats were going to campaign this year on the promise of putting two missiles in every backyard. In the current uproar over alleged military deficiencies, the Democratic party was well on its way to becoming the party of panic and confusion, the sounding board of the aviation-missiles industry, the court of last resort for dissatisfied Generals and Admirals, the party of an intensified arms race. The United States presented the strange and illuminating spectacle of the only capitalist-democratic power in which the more liberal party was less friendly to disarmament than the conservative. This reflects the economic interest of our labor movement in the arms race, the opposition of the Roman Catholic hierarchy (more powerful in the Democratic than the Republican party) to relaxation of world tension, the inflationary tendencies historically characteristic of the Democrats and the vested emotional interest of the Truman-Acheson leadership in the cold war it fathered with its Stalin-Molotov opposite number.

Kennedy's Maiden Effort Superb

The first welcome signs of a change began to appear last week. An anxiety at the grass roots is beginning to make itself felt among the younger and more independent men in the party. Clark (*D. Pa.*), one of the most thoughtful men in the Senate, began sounding out colleagues on the need to counterbalance the speeches on military deficiency orchestrated by Symington with a day on which the Democrats would stress the Administration's weakness in preparing for the Geneva arms talks and outline a party policy on disarmament. A statement signed by Clark and Humphrey (as chairman of the Senate disarmament subcommittee) was circulated last week-end. It warned that "in some quarters the Democrats are said to be more concerned with military defense and preparations for war than with positive programs for peace and disarmament" and suggested that to correct this impression "a policy statement and discussion by Democrats on arms control is essential." Despite some coolness on the part of Lyndon Johnson, it was decided after discussions with Kennedy and Symington to stage such a discussion in the Senate last Tuesday. Unfortunately personal rivalry between Humphrey and Kennedy led the latter to make his speech in Durham, New Hampshire, last Monday instead, and though he was in Washington Tuesday, Kennedy did not participate. It is a pity because his speech, his maiden effort in the general field of disarmament,* a topic to which he had hitherto paid little attention, was superb. The text was put into the Congressional Record Monday by Clark.

The appearance of Kennedy in an arena where Humphrey has performed in spendid if wistful isolation for five years is a major break-through. It means that all the Democratic hopefuls must now take a position on disarmament, and even Symington has a speech ready on the subject which he intended to make Tuesday but was unable to because the hour was late and the cloture petition about to be filed. Humphrey delivered a full-dress speech on disarmament. The Humphrey and Kennedy positions are much alike, in stressing the poor preparations of the Administration for the renewed arms talks and the need for some new "Peace Agency" (Humphrey) or "Arms Control Research Agency" (Kennedy) to study such problems as nuclear test detection. Clark and Humphrey are trying to find a common denominator for the party by saying that higher military spending must be coupled with real negotiations for disarmament. This "arm to parley" line seems an effort to move in opposite directions at the same time, a not unfamiliar campaign feat, but marks an improvement over past emphasis on the arms race alone as the only path to security. The dynamics of the campaign may shift the party's position and exert real pressure on the Administration, particularly if the rumblings of discontent from the rank-and-file can be maintained and intensified. We applaud Senator Clark's initiative and commend Senator Kennedy's position.

The Only Hope for A Sick World

"When a country spends over $100 billion a year for weapons which everyone hopes it will never have to use . . . weapons in a war that no one could win . . . this is a clear mark of a kind of mental sickness in the world that necessitates some very careful treatment and the treatment that I propose is to slow down the arms race . . . to disarm the international atmosphere of the fear and the hysteria which grip it."

—Humphrey (D. Minn.) in the Senate, March 8.

"No leader of any nation should rest content with this precarious equilibrium of terror. No nation should delude itself into thinking it has a strategy for the 1960's if that strategy is nothing more than the arms race. . . . The world of 1960 . . . requires a new and different look. . . . Today's international climate, more than ever before, holds out the possibility for an effective start on arms control. For the Russians know . . . as well as we know that a war of mutual destruction would benefit no nation or ideology. . . . Peace programs involve risks . . . but risks of arms are even more dangerous. . . . There is no greater defense against total nuclear destruction than total nuclear disarmament."

—Kennedy (D. Mass.) at Durham, N. H., March 7.

*** On an equally high level was Kennedy's speech last Nov. 2 at UCLA in California when he took issue with Rockefeller on testing, saying that resumption might be more of a disadvantage militarily than a help and declaring, "We have not made as concentrated an effort on techniques for preserving mankind as we have on techniques of destruction." The text was not made available here at the time and we have just seen it.**

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Fallacies Behind the Proposals to Give Europe An "Independent Deterrent"

London Times Military Expert States Case Against Nuclear Arms for NATO

We present here in slightly abridged form the most striking and authoritative analysis we have seen of the military and political fallacies underlying proposals to give the NATO nations nuclear arms, either directly as suggested by the President, or in the form of a NATO nuclear force as suggested by General Norstad. This appeared in The Times of London Feb. 11 under the heading "Nuclear Arms for NATO?" with the by-line, "From Our Defence Correspondent."

"There seem to be three main ideas behind these suggestions. The first is that, to make the western deterrent more convincing, nuclear weapons in Europe should be put under some form of NATO, as opposed to American, control. Otherwise, it is argued, the Russians may doubt whether America would risk destruction of her cities to save Europe.

"The second idea, that some form of NATO control is necessary to promote European confidence in the alliance, is complementary to the first. Europeans, too, may doubt whether America would risk suicide on their behalf.

"The third idea is that to put nuclear weapons under NATO might be a useful form of arms control. Other NATO countries may feel driven to develop nuclear weapons of their own. Perhaps this might be avoided if the NATO nations could be given a common nuclear capability.

A Recipe for Paralysis

"Analysis of the first idea suggests that there would be no gain in the credibility of the deterrent if NATO became an atomic power. Doubts about the credibility of the present Anglo-American nuclear forces as a deterrent to *conventional* aggression against Europe are understandable. But how could a nuclear deterrent, the use of which would be suicidal for Europe, be any more credible if it was controlled by up to 15 nations instead of by one or two as at present? It looks like a recipe for paralysis.

"If we rule this out, what about the credibility of a NATO nuclear force as a deterrent against *nuclear* aggression in Europe?" It could hardly be more credible than the present system whereby American forces are deployed on the Continent and are bound to be involved in any conflict there.

"There are two components to any deterrent, credibility and effectiveness. If a NATO deterrent could not increase credibility, could it increase effectiveness? Let us assume that the European countries contribute toward its cost. How would the extra money be spent?

"To guarantee retaliation against a nuclear attack the deterrent weapons would have to be able to survive it. Though land-based missiles can be 'hardened' by burying them and surrounding them with concrete, they are still vulnerable to a fairly accurate nuclear attack. British experience with the Thor missile sites suggests that it would be impossible to keep missile bases in Europe secret. It might be possible to attain some degree of invulnerability by sheer numbers, but Europe would then have to bristle with more missile sites than any aggressor could find missiles to destroy. There would be no end to a rat race of this kind.

"The only possibility of adding to the effectiveness of the deterrent on the Continent would be by putting it to sea. Reasonable invulnerability might be attained by putting missiles on submarines to keep them invisible, or on surface craft to keep them elusive, though communications would be a serious problem.

They'd Begin to Fear Each Other

"This affects the second underlying idea, that it would help to promote European confidence in the alliance. The governing factor here would be how much (or little) control was vested in the Continental countries. If they were given a decisive say, then their resentments against the Anglo-American nuclear monopoly ought certainly to disappear. *But in their place they would probably have new fears about each other because the hydrogen bomb, being an absolute weapon, calls for absolute allies.* [Italics added].

"Finally we come to arms control. No one can say whether participation in a common deterrent would remove from other NATO countries the ambitions or fears that have driven Britain and France to develop nuclear weapons. But General de Gaulle has made it abundantly clear that he will not be fobbed off with anything short of complete nuclear independence. Two things are clear amid these uncertainties. The first is that the establishment of a NATO deterrent force, backed by America's technical resources, would place a great many more nuclear weapons in Europe than the present laborious growth of independent nuclear possibilities could possibly do. This could affect future negotiations on disarmament, and provoke Russia to deploy nuclear weapons in the satellite countries.

"The second is that if the European countries contributed to the cost of the NATO deterrent they would almost certainly spend that much less on their conventional forces, which are the bedrock of General Norstad's defenses. Would that be a wise exchange?"

14 Congressmen Call for 4-Power Talks to Block Spread of Atom Weapons

"Whereas the dispersion and transfer of nuclear weapons to other nations will decrease the chance for negotiating effective international agreements for control of nuclear weapons . . . render it more difficult to reach agreement on disarmament . . . increase the chance of nuclear accidents, and of nuclear irresponsibility and nuclear blackmail . . . result in the heightening of international tensions and . . . threaten the survival of our civilization, and of the human race: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress (1) that the United States should not transfer nuclear weapons or nuclear weapons secrets to other nations, and (2) that the President should undertake negotiations immediately with the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and France to seek agreements prohibiting the transfer of nuclear weapons and nuclear weapons secrets from one nation to another."

—H. Con. Res. 598 (whereases omitted) by Kowalski, D. Conn.; Identical Resolutions by Mrs. Green, D. Ore.; Johnson, D. Col.; Meyer, D. Vt.; Roosevelt, D. Cal.; Wolf, D. Iowa; Giaimo, D. Conn.; Porter, D. Ore.; Rivers, D. Ala.; Lane, D. Mass.; Levering, D. Ohio; Clem Miller, D. Cal.; Dent, D. Pa. and Moeller, D. Ohio.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Where Could They Have Gotten That Queer Idea We Often Support Dictators?

Some Sample Misunderstandings Ike Corrected in Latin America

"Another persistent misunderstanding which I sought to correct wherever I travelled is that we sometimes support dictators. Of course we abhor all tyrannical forms of government, whether of the left or right."

—Eisenhower TV report on South American trip, March 9.

"During 1952 the Truman Administration apparently had few qualms about singing mutual defense assistance pacts with the dictatorial regimes then in power in Cuba, Peru and Colombia, and the Eisenhower Administration followed a similar practice with the Dominican Republic [Trujillo] in 1953 and Nicaragua in 1954 . . .

"The Eisenhower Administration has gone even further in manifestations of open support for authoritarian military regimes. In November 1954 President Eisenhower presented Legion of Merit citations to [two dictators since overthrown Presidents Odria (Peru) and Perez Jiminez (Venezuela)].

—Post World War II Political Developments in Latin America, Report No. 1 to Morse (American Republics) subcommittee of Senate Foreign Relations, Nov. 19, 1959.

"In Brazil, I explained another item of our policy: We believe in the right of people to choose their own form of government . . . to abide by their own philosophy."

—Eisenhower on his South American trip, March 8.

"There are many ways in which the United States could aid Brazilian development without resorting to balance of payments loans. For example, if Petrobras, the Brazilian Government oil monopoly, had additional capital to expand its production more rapidly, material foreign exchange savings could be made through a reduction in oil imports. The refusal of the U.S. to deal with Petrobras, simply because it is a government monopoly, seems altogther too doctrinaire."

—Senator Aiken (R. Vt.) Report on trip to Latin America for Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Feb. 2, 1960.

"When internal social reform is required, it is purely an internal matter."

—Eisenhower on his South American trip, March 8.

"One of the complaints which is frequently heard about the United States in Venezuela and elsewhere in Latin America is that it views liberal reform governments askance and does not really care about social progress."

—Aiken's report, Feb. 2.

Russell's Convert to Free Speech

Bertrand Russell may take satisfaction in an unexpected achievement. His debate with Edward Teller on "Small World" the past two Sundays seems to have converted the latter into a passionate libertarian. Over and over again, Dr. Teller stressed the preservation of free speech as an issue so overriding as to justify the use of weapons which could destroy mankind. Dr. Teller has never before displayed an interest in free speech.

As we watched Dr. Teller harping on an issue to which he has always been indifferent in a debate with a philosopher who has fought for free speech all his life and gone to prison for it (in World War I), we were reminded of the story about King Solomon and the two women who claimed the same child. Solomon shrewdly offered to cut the child in half and give a piece to each. The true mother revealed herself by rejecting this with horror and offering to give up the child instead.

Those who love free speech are not so ready to destroy the only kind of a world in which it may flourish. An arms race between two garrison states is not conducive to intellectual freedom. The military bureaucrats and apocalyptic anti-Communists for whom Dr. Teller speaks are the enemies of freedom, not its defenders.

"One of the most far-reaching problems of continental scope is this . . . the Latin American countries are largely single commodity countries . . . The real solution is in agricultural and industrial diversification."

—Eisenhower on his South American trip, March 8.

"The United States has made this dilemma unnecessarily difficult by deliberately selecting the kinds of production it will help to increase. The emphasis in Bolivia ought to be on the things Bolivia needs and can produce. In the agricultural field, these include wheat, sugar, rice, and cotton, all of which except sugar, are surplus in the United States. As a consequence, the United States will not do anything to help with their production in Bolivia, despite the remoteness of the prospect of ever making significant commercial sales to that country."

—Senator Morse (D. Ore.) Report on his South American trip to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Feb. 20.

The Bigger Issue Which Lurks Behind the Los Angeles Anonymous Handbill Case

Behind the bitterly split decision in the Supreme Court last Monday holding unconstitutional a Los Angeles ordinance forbidding the circulation of anonymous handbills is the shadow of a bigger issue the Court will soon face. This is whether, under the Internal Security Act of 1950, the Subversive Activities Control Board can force publications and radio-TV casts to label themselves "communistic" if in the Board's opinion they follow party line.

Mr. Justice Black's decision in Talley v. California contains an eloquent passage on the part that anonymous pamphleteering played in the English and American Revolutions. "Persecuted groups and sects," he wrote, "from time to time throughout history have been able to criticize oppressive practices and laws either anonymously or not at all." Mr. Justice Harlan concurred on the ground that the Los Angeles ordinance was not limited to preventing fraud or libel.

Mr. Justices Frankfurter and Whittaker joined in the dissent by Mr. Justice Clark who protested, "the Constitution says nothing about freedom of anonymous speech." The theory behind the "labelling" provisions of the Internal Security Act is that the government may label dangerous ideas as it labels dangerous foods and drugs. It is only one step from requiring the source to be identified to a requirement that the political nature of the source also be disclosed. A government board like the SACB would then determine if this was disclosed correctly, i.e. whether the source was "communistic." Thus the SACB could police the written and spoken word.

Mr. Justice Stewart who joined the liberals in the Los Angeles case may be the decisive vote when the Konigsberg case reaches the Court again. Certiorari was granted last Monday. California law excludes from the bar anyone who advocates overthrow of the government. Konigsberg denied such advocacy but refused on principle to say whether he was or ever had been a Communist. The bar examiners held this showed lack of good moral character. The Court three years ago reversed, Black for the majority, Harlan, Clark and Frankfurter dissenting. Whittaker, newly appointed, took no part, but sides usually with them. Burton was with the majority. Stewart has since replaced him. Konigsberg was given a new hearing, again refused to answer and was again excluded, advocacy of overthrow being inferred from refusal to answer the question.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Un-American Staff Director Arens Also Paid Consultant on Weird Genetics Projects

Walter, Eastland and Arens Linked With Multi-Millionaire Racist Angel

Richard Arens, staff director of the Un-American Activities Committee (salary 1959: $16,409.86), also serves as a privately paid consultant to a multi-millionaire New Yorker, Wycliffe Draper, in allocating grants to researchers in the field of genetics. Draper's interest, according to an exclusive story by Ronald H. May, Washington correspondent of the York, Pa., *Gazette and Daily* and the Madison, Wis., *Capital-Times,* is in proving Negro inferiority. "As far as I could tell," Sheldon Reed, director of the Dwight Institute of Human Genetics at the University of Minnesota, told May of his contacts with Draper, "he thought the country would be better off without Negroes" and was interested in resettling them in Africa.

"In an interview several weeks ago," May wrote in the March 4 issue of the York *Gazette and Daily,* "Arens admitted that he serves as a Draper consultant. The staff director sees nothing wrong with his activity but refused to describe the research projects. His role is only to 'recommend' projects, subject to later approval by a committee. He would not name the persons who compose it."

Both Chairman Walter of the House Committee and Chairman Eastland of the Senate Internal Security committee were linked to Draper by the May story. The former told May he had himself recently visited the University of Dakar in West Africa in connection with a project he wants Draper to finance —"a plan for the improvement of African universities to promote stability in native governments." [Perhaps also by establishing Un-African Activities Committees?—IFS.]

Draper refused to talk with May and referred him to his lawyer, Harry Wehyer. Wehyer indicated that two committees make awards of Draper funds, that Arens only serves as paid consultant to one of them, and that Senator Eastland was connected with "the other one." Wehyer said Chairman Walter was also "involved" in the giving of Draper grants but would not disclose the membership of the committees.

"Newsmen first heard of Draper last year," May wrote, "when Dr. Anthony Bouscaren resigned a political science professorship at Marquette University in Milwaukee in a dispute with university authorities over his acceptance of Draper grants. In a foreword to a 1959 book, Bouscaren thanked Arens for assistance. Arens and Bouscaren have appeared together on programs of the Christian Anti-Communist crusade and similar right wing groups. The staff director said he hired Bouscaren as a consultant to the Un-American Activities Committee.

Arens Also Advised McCarthy Backer H. L. Hunt

Arens told May that Draper also gives money to "patriotic" organizations fighting Communism. Draper, heir to a Massachusetts textile machinery fortune, "was first introduced to the political scene" by the late Senator Pat McCarran of Nevada. Arens said that he has also advised other wealthy men, including H. L. Hunt, the Texas oilman who backed McCarthy, and Smith Richardson, the North Carolina pharmaceutical manufacturer, on the grant of funds to patriotic organizations.

"The committee director," May reported of his interview with Arens, "does not intend to investigate racist or hate groups because they are isolated and unimportant."

Academic Freedom Finds New Defender

"In the middle of a scholarly sociology lecture at the University of Colorado, up jumped the most conspicuous member of the class, statuesque, blonde Marilyn Van Derbur, 22, Miss America of 1958, to challenge Associate Professor Howard Higman. Would he comment on J. Edgar Hoover's Masters of Deceit? The professor obliged by launching into a denunciation of the FBI, and for two days embattled factions of the 190-student class, led by Marilyn and the professor, argued the reputation of the FBI. Proving Marilyn's point that the FBI is always on the spot, Author Hoover sent Marilyn an autographed copy of Masters of Deceit with the message: 'Your actions in confronting error with truth are in keeping with the highest traditions of academic freedom.'"

—Time Magazine, March 7.

IFS Speaks on "First Amendment and Academic Freedom", Columbia Univ., Friday, March 18, 8 P.M.

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

3/14/60

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington 15, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED